DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 083 241 SP 007 441

AUTHOR Connelly, F. Michael; Dienes, Barbara
TITLE The Teacher As Choice Maker in Curriculum Development: A Case Study.
INSTITUTION Ontario Inst. for Studies in Education, Toronto.
PUB DATE Feb 73
NOTE 17p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Curriculum Development; *Curriculum Planning; Educational Improvement; Teacher Education; *Teacher Participation; *Teacher Responsibility; *Teacher Role

ABSTRACT

This paper presents a theoretical account of a two-year case study of eight deliberating teachers in curriculum development. A conception of the eclectic and problematic habits of mind required by intelligent teacher deliberation and choice is presented. The conceptual resolution of the teacher role is based on theoretical considerations of the overall purpose of development, the teacher's role in development, and empirical data obtained in the discourse of deliberating teachers. Results of this study will have educational possibilities for the improvement of curriculum development, for the realization of effective teacher-based curriculum planning, and for the in-service and preservice education of teachers. (Authors)

ED 083241

THE TEACHER AS CHOICE MAKER IN CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT: A CASE STUDY

[Draft]

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

F. Michael Connelly

&

Barbara Dienes

The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education
Toronto, Ontario, Canada

February, 1973

SP 007 441

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

THE TEACHER AS CHOICE MAKER IN CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT: A CASE STUDY[1]

F. Michael Connelly & Barbara Dienes

THE PROBLEMATIC CONTEXT

The problematic context for the ideas and work described herein is given in a previous paper of mine, "The Functions of Curriculum Development."[2] My purpose was to diagnose the functions of curricular development and to effect a conceptual cure by examination of the roles of external developers and teacher users. My prime observation was the widespread disaffection with centralized curriculum development as it has operated since the mid-1950s. One response to this feeling has been to augment the top-down technological strategies of centralized development. Another has been the opposite, namely, to decentralize curriculum development and make it a local school activity. The inadequacies of each of these responses provides my platform, which is that external developers and local user developers each have their special functions to perform in the overall activity of curriculum development.

These functions are clarified by distinguishing between external development and local user development in terms of their respective ends, starting points, methods, and functions. The end of curriculum development as a whole is some image of man or of society, but the proximate ends for user and external development are different. For external development the proximate end is a material product and for user development it is a classroom-in-action. It is the proper realization of these separate proximate ends that contributes to the harmonious achievement of the overall end of development.

The proximate end serves as a starting point in development such that the external developer begins with an image of materials, while the teacher developer begins with an image of the classroom. In addition, the external developer is motivated to begin development by his belief in a new theory or view that he wishes to translate into practice, while the teacher is motivated to correct identifiable lacks or needs in his own instructional setting. The different starting points, the images of the proximate ends, and the motivations for development govern the development conduct of the respective developers.

Methodologically, external development is best seen as a linear sequence of if-then tests of the means of embodying developer intentions, while teacher development is best seen as a deliberative process in which theoretical

perspectives and practical matters enter into reciprocal interplay in the realization of instructional images.

These differences in end, starting point, and methodology lead to a simple distinction between the functions of external and local user development. The function of external development is to elaborate theoretical conceptions of society, knowledge, teacher, and learner and to translate these conceptions into coherent curriculum materials, each of which serves as a clear-cut alternative available to teachers. For maximum utility to teachers, the materials ought to include a layman's account of the theoretical basis for the materials and an account of the curricular possibilities latent in them. The function of teacher development is to construct images of particular instructional settings, and to translate these images into a curriculum-in-classroom use. In this translation teachers choose from among available materials those that best suit their images.

The construction and use of teacher images of their instructional setting constitutes the central focus of the study reported herein. The following pages describe the origins and conceptions of and in our work with teachers, as well as the long-term stages and findings of the study.

ORIGINS OF THE STUDY

Currently, the responsibility for curriculum development is decentralizing. In the United States this move is seen in the de-emphasis of large-scale national projects and, in Canada, in the provincial government's release of curriculum control. For instance, in Ontario the efforts of the curriculum branch of the Ontario Ministry of Education are aimed at encouraging local autonomy in curriculum matters. To this end the Ministry prepares "Guidelines" for curriculum development in various subject areas and grade levels and gives advice to local boards, principals and teachers through its regional consultants.

The recent concern for locally-based curriculum development is not, of course, new. This was one of the themes of neo-progressive education in the United States and parts of Canada prior to the large-scale centralized development begun in the 1950's. It is well known that the locus of curriculum development oscillates back and forth between curricula developed locally and curricula developed outside local settings and introduced locally

by implementation and dissemination processes.[3] As noted previously, I have provided a conceptual resolution of these oscillations. However, without an understanding of how teachers may effectively enter into curriculum development and, concomitantly, without adequate training to support their development activities, teachers will tend to retreat from their beurocratically imposed responsibilities. The first signs of teacher retreat are already in existence in Ontario where the Ontario Teachers' Federation has presented a brief to the Ministry of Education demanding a return to a system of compulsory courses and a reduction in the optional teacher, and teacher-student, planned courses. Among other things the credit system is designed to provide programs suited to individual needs and aspirations. On this point the brief states:

> It would be difficult to find a school in which even one student's program is being orchestrated to suit his current state of development.

The brief continues:

> Certainly the imposition of complex option sheets, computer scheduling and course numbers has encouraged slick repackaging--not substantive change--in teaching and learning procedures.

Those of us who are heavily involved with the in-service education of teachers, both in our research and development and in our instruction, are not surprised at the sentiments expressed in the brief. The Curriculum Department of the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education has been flooded with requests from local school boards, teacher committees, and individual teachers for advice on curriculum planning. It is in the spirit of understanding something of the character of teacher-based development that we have undertaken the case study described herein.

Dimensions of Teacher Role: Admittedly, teachers are under pressure and they want, and need, quick action when faced with program planning problems. Furthermore, their newfound responsibilities may leave them with little patience for the slow, doubtful process of study. In addition, some teachers may acquire an arrogance about their development abilities born of their ignorance of the magnitude of the task. On the other hand, I believe that these hindrances will be offset as frustration and a desire for understanding sets in after extended periods of committee work. The teachers in my own intensive case study of Teacher Deliberation and Choice report these exact feelings.

Given access to teachers, a host of teacher-based questions on development emerge. One set of questions runs as follows: What should they develop--units,

programs, overall plans, laboratories, what? What is wrong with what they are now teaching? What is more desirable? Is there a discrepancy between what they believe ought to be taught and what is taught? How can they diagnose the needs of their students? What sort of school are they in? Does the principal provide a climate conducive to this or that sort of curriculum? Should students be involved in the curriculum planning? How about parents? Even if teachers can agree on the right questions, what tools do they have to deal with the answers? Another set of questions runs: What does Skinner and his machines, and behavioral modification, have to do with English education? What does one make of the academic who spoke on knowledge structures? On learning theory? On performance testing? On open plans? On individualized instruction? On most anything that one can imagine in a theoretical sphere? Another major question asks: Even if the teacher has a modicum of understanding of the theoretical possibilities and their alternatives, how is he to deal with these in the context of the range of practical questions asked of his teaching situation? Still another set of questions ask, why are we doing the developing? Why not the Board or the Ministry? What can we do even if we think our way through these problems? Do we have the time or the energy? If we do this, why do we need a ministry? What is the researchers role? Are the centralized projects needed? How do we relate to them? In short, what does it mean for us to be treated as developers?

These questions highlight three dimensions of our work with teachers. The first relates to practice. Here, we are concerned to conceptualize the teachers expertise on the circumstantial aspects of a teaching situation and to place these at the centre of our view of the teachers role in development. The second set of questions relate to the role we see for knowledge and externally based curriculum development in the teacher based development setting. Furthermore, we are concerned to articulate a relationship between theoretical knowledge and practice for purposes of teacher use. The third set of questions relate to our attempt to help teachers reach a view of themselves as developers. They need a sense of where they stand in the development process, what their responsibilities are, what they can do better than anyone else, and where they need from the outside. Our problem then consists of conceptualizing a role for the teacher with respect to practice and theory and to develop mechanisms by which teachers reach an operational understanding of themselves as developers.

The Target Group: There are, of course, various kinds and organizations of teachers on which we might focus our study. Teachers work as individuals, as subject area committee groups within the schools and between schools, on school-wide curriculum committees and so on. Our work is aimed at a small subject-matter committee composed entirely of teachers from one school board with about three hours per week of meetings available for curriculum planning and an equivalent amount of time for individual reading. Our case study is being conducted with seven junior high school science teachers, most of them are department heads, from a Toronto suburb. We began meeting in May, 1972, and, with the exception of the summer months, have met thereafter at two to four week intervals. There have been twelve sessions in all. We generally meet on Fridays and our sessions range from four to eight hours in length. Sessions are taped for later transcription and analysis. Materials are prepared sufficiently in advance of sessions so that at each session the teachers plan the scope of discussion for the subsequent session. We do not "instruct" in the sessions, and the sessions are almost entirely under the direction of the teachers. The subject matter ranges from the materials brought to the sessions by the project staff, to discussions of problems and issues in the school board and in the individual schools and, frequently, on the purpose and direction of the project itself. The data presented herein is based on exerpts from seven sessions ranging from the first, on May 15, 1972, to the most recent, on February 9, 1973.

THE TEACHER AS CURRICULUM DEVELOPER

Two key features of our treatment of the teacher as developer are 1) the language of practical ethics consistent with Schwab's view of the most productive way of talking about curriculum,[4] and 2) our notion of development as the embodiment of images of man or of society. I shall not repeat the substance of Schwab's arguments since these have been analyzed, extended, and evaluated in a recent issue of Curriculum Theory Network.[5] Suffice it to say that we have adopted the overall language of the practical and, in particular, the notion of deliberation. In addition we have used Schwab's notion of "the eclectic" for the early stages of our study;[6] but we have found Dewey's notions on enquiry and the problematic situation more useful in the later stages of our work. Four "practical" concerns of our study are: a) a concern for particular school situations, b) a concern for making choices and creating plans for action, c) a concern for a deliberative methodology for the achievement of choice, d) a concern for the teacher as the deliberative agent.

Our view of the role of the teacher in development is highlighted by contrast with a recent argument by Westbury to the effect that curriculum ought to turn from development to research of "what is." He writes:

> . . . too often we have not been able, because of our commitment to what should be, to look at what is, to ask why. To look at what is betrays, our emphases suggest, too little passion, even perhaps a conservative willingness to accept schools as they are. All too often our emphases imply a condemnation of what schools do, with the consequence that we have difficulty with accepting even the possibility that the schools have in fact achieved in doing well many of the things that they set out to achieve.
>
> Curriculum is, we suggest, irrelevant to much of the practice going on because it has ignored that practice, because it has ignored schooling as it is . . . .[7]

There is much in Westbury's work with which I agree. But his criticism of development is exaggerated and his understanding of the phenomena of curriculum is, in important respects, erroneous. Furthermore, his view leaves no place for the role of the teacher in development even though his work focuses on teaching and the classroom.

The content of curricula in all fields have been brought up to date and organized according to a variety of structures; laboratories are far more extensively in use today than twenty years ago; students learn new mechanized computational skills; there are effective "open" classrooms and "individualized" instructional programs; and teachers widely know of key educational figures such as Gagne, Bloom, Schwab, Ausubel, and Piaget. Westbury himself admits to

his exaggeration when he notes that the "goals of the nineteenth century founders of public universal education have been amply fulfilled." To do this, considerable change has taken place.

Westbury's exaggeration is related to his erronious view that curriculum phenomena may be effectively treated as a given which sits comfortably by as the schools are modified and changed. That is, what Westbury wants to study in some pristine form is, itself subject to change. As Aristotle has said of practical subject matters, "they may be otherwise."

It is not my purpose, however, to detract from Westbury's legitimate concern to focus curriculum research on the phenomena of curriculum. Rather, I would argue that such research proceed by first recognizing the intimacy of curriculum development and the phenomena of curriculum and not, as Westbury would have it, proceed by separating the two. This view is unexceptional and constitutes a simple application of Dewey's notion of the interaction of subject and predicate in enquiry.[8] These remarks will suffice to set the stage for viewing the teacher as curriculum developer. (Further consideration of the interdependence of curriculum development, curriculum phenomena, and curriculum research would be highly profitable in another context).

The separation of development from the phenomena of curriculum leaves the teacher in a manipulated role. For instance, Westbury applies his analysis of Aristotelian rhetoric to curriculum and writes:

> Curriculum development is a productive art. By virtue of the faculty of a curriculum developer matters, subjects, teachers, students, and milieus, are made to move and so become something that they could not become in and of themselves. The fruits of this art are things or situations created by a curriculum developer, as artist, to embody the forms he holds as essential to education. To act in this way on his matters, the curriculum developer needs an awareness of the educated possibilities that might be inherent in any particular school situation.[9]

As I have pointed out in "The Functions" paper, it is this view of the teacher as being "made to move" by external developers, combined with the view that the external developer is responsible for all things in development, that lies at the heart of the failures of curriculum development. Given this two-part view I would tend to agree with Westbury that curriculum ought to turn much of its attention away from development. But the separation of developer and teacher functions, coordinated within the overall purpose of development, can, as I have previously demonstrated, lead to a measure of progressive development.

Let me repeat, the end of curriculum development as a whole is some image of man or of society; but the proximate ends for user and external development are different. For external development the proximate end is a material product and for user development it is a classroom-in-action. The function of teacher development is to construct images of particular classroom settings by matching a variety of theoretical conceptions with the exigencies of these settings, and to translate these images into a curriculum-in-classroom use.

Now, the teacher is part of those instructional settings. That is, the teacher's image of the end-in-view consists, in part, of an image of his own role in the situation; of what he is as a teacher and what he is doing relative to the subject field, to the students and to the milieu. The question before us at this point, thanks to Westbury, is "how can the teacher improve the quality of his instruction while at the same time maintaining a connection with 'what is'?"

For teachers in courses at schools of education and the like, the matter is relatively simple, although difficult to enact. It involves the time-honored instructional mechanism of shaking the student conceptually loose from his moorings and skillfully guiding him through the drifting period to the point of a more powerful cognitive outlook. Brilliant teaching, and skillful psychoanalysis, proceed by disruption. But in the ongoing affairs of schools, particularly in settings such as those in our case study where we have no direct access to the minds of teachers, other mechanisms are necessary to insure growth and improvement on the one hand and continuity with "what is" on the other. Without growth the teachers waste their time, and without continuity the outcome is failure.

We believe that these two features, progressive change and continuity, may be achieved through adequately designed deliberation. Through deliberation, teachers explore characteristics of the practical situation, theoretical perspectives, and alternatives, and they do this in a haphazard reflexive way in which tentative notions, thoughts, values, and ideas are continually checked and balanced against other thoughts, ideas, and values. We have found that our teachers delight in this process but often become impatient since the process lacks the precise direction and boundaries imposed by instruction.

Deliberation serves one other crucial purpose for groups of people who, by choice or by command, find themselves working together--namely that the images derived from the process of deliberation are shared. That is, over time there

is an overall sharing of language such that fewer and fewer clarifications are required. What would have once been cryptic is now sufficient. The shared imagery permits, we find, considerable differences between teachers and, in fact, may even highlight these differences. What is important is that there is an understanding and acceptance of the validity of the positions taken by different members of the group. Thus, to the extent that individuals, and the group as a whole, contrive operational images of classrooms there is both growth and continuity. Growth resides in the imagery, and an understanding of its parts and sources; and continuity resides in the fact that the imagery was constructed out of "what is" (i.e. characteristics of the situation) and what "could be" (i.e. theoretical parameters).

DELIBERATIVE MOVEMENTS BETWEEN THEORY AND PRACTICE

There are three movements in the deliberations planned for our case study teachers--toward a view of their role as developers; eclectic movements among theoretical choice points and between these and practice; and the recognition diagnosis and problem solution of the teachers' practical situation in terms of theoretical choices.

Teacher Role

The curriculum development role of teachers involves a recognition of delegated responsibilities of, for example, the Ontario Ministry of Education; and an exploration of the teachers' strengths, limitations, and role in development. We have found that there is an urge on the part of teachers to construct such an understanding of their role and we have repeatedly returned to this notion throughout our twelve sessions. It is this view of themselves combined with the urgency of their delegated responsibilities that supports and maintains the motivation to continue in this slow and often frustrating process of study.

Eclectic Movements

A full description of the "eclectic" is found in Schwab's "The E lectic." Schwab's account assumes a university instructional setting and his exploration of the possibilities of the eclectic is rigorous and extensive. Our work, focused as it is on the ongoing committee work of school teachers, radically modifies Schwab's notion of the eclectic so that what we do is both broader and less rigorous. It is broader in that we provide our teachers with a range of theoretical choice points in psychology, philosophy, and philosophy, and sociology, and we furthermore provide a range of alternatives

within each. Schwab, on the other hand, is satisfied to examine a single choice point with, perhaps, only one alternative. Our work is less rigorous in that Schwab has brought to bear his long-standing research and instructional armory--an armory which consists of principles of enquiry, issues of principle, commonplaces, patterns of enquiry and the usual array of factors involved in making defensible knowledge claims.

Our approach is restricted to five broad aims, 1) skill at uncovering as assumptions in written work; 2) skill in the examination of some of the evidential and argumentative bases of positions made; 3) treating theoretical positions as potential prescriptions for practice and, consequently, skill at considering the educational possibilities attached to such positions; 4) skill at comparing the first three for different theoretical positions within a theoretical choice point; and 5) skill at matching the assumptions and educational possibilities in theoretical positions with the teachers' own value stances, thereby achieving what we call "theoretically preferred choices." (Note that an explication of the choice points, their alternatives and the notion of a theoretically preferred choice are fully elaborated in "The Functions" paper.) The first, second, and fourth of these aims are concerned to examine the theoretical position itself, while the third and fifth are movements from the stance to practice and to self.

Diagnosis and Problem Solving

The diagnosis and problem-solving movement is constituted by a consideration of what is possible, likely, desired, and required by the teachers' actual curriculum situation. For this stage of our work we are governed in our thinking by Dewey's notions on enquiry. Four key aims of our work at this stage are: 1) the development of skills at examining the ongoing classroom situation of the teacher, i.e. to develop the ability to stand back from the situation, and to identify what is significant and generic about the situation; 2) diagnosis of weaknesses in the teaching situation which become the focus for subsequent curriculum planning; 3) skills at evaluation and judgment consisting both of an examination of the practical situation and of the theoretically preferred choices from the eclectic movement and yielding what we call "practically preferred choices." These choices become the starting point for plans for action; 4) the making of plans. In this process the practically preferred choices are treated as defeasible, that is, as subject to modification and change as teachers plan, and modify their plans; and 5) following

instruction, the reflexive examination of practically preferred choices, of plans and of instructional actions.

Unlike the case for the theoretical aspect of choice, the teachers in our study are not presented with a framework for deliberation on the practical aspect. Rather, their deliberations are listened to and every situation-linked reason offered in support or rejection of a choice is recorded. From these it is hoped eventually to develop a framework of the practical aspects of choice useful to deliberating teachers. We do, however, propose to begin deliberation with a simple set of instructional commonplaces which will provide an initial guide to the examination and diagnosis of the actual teaching situation. These are: the teacher, the student, the materials of instruction, the phenomenon of science (in our study), the ideas of science (in our study), and the milieu. Various combinations of these yield accounts of instructional methodology, of learning methodology, of a view of the nature of the subject matter, and so forth. For instance, two of the possible roles of materials in the teachers' instructional setting are as the authoritative source on the content of science or as a stimulus to discussion. Furthermore, in the relationship of materials to ideas it may be found that materials are treated as the embodiment of ideas which need only to be extracted, as an auxiliary resource to science ideas developed otherwise in instruction; or, as data sources for stimulating independent student induction of science ideas.

The evaluation that emerges from this examination of the classroom, combined with the evaluation involved in the eclectic movement results in judgments and a statement of the practically preferred choices of individual teachers and, of the group. These practically preferred choices, along with the language and terminology utilized in their development, constitute the teachers' imagery of the classroom situation. That is, to use our earlier language, the end-in-view. This imagery becomes the starting point for the planning of curricula and it is our goal to have teachers treat these as hypotheses for change. Thus, both in the development of the plans and in the reflexive examination post-instruction, the imagery is continually and habitually reevaluated.

The Bridges Between Movements

The bridges between the eclectic movement, and the diagnostic and problem-solving movement, is the teacher's experience and proper confidence in himself as a developer. The analysis and recovery of meaning in the eclectic movement

may proceed without passion or commitment. But experience in teaching is required to adequately ground the theoretically preferred choices, particularly in the degree to which those choices reflect a consideration of the educational possibilities in theoretical positions treated as prescriptions for practice. In this, experience is a generic characteristic and it is equally valid to draw people together from widely different backgrounds in the stage of eclectic movement.

However, the diagnostic and problem-solving movement requires an immediate experience of the particular, that is, participation in, and an understanding of, a particular existential classroom situation. It is at this point that genuine differences between teachers emerge since each has experience of his own classroom. To the extent that teachers either come from a single school or a single school board, common features of experience may be shared. We find this a powerful influence in our discussion, where our teachers spend anywhere up to a half day in our deliberative sessions dealing with matters such as the climate in North York schools, the latest meeting of science heads, and recent school board directives. For the teacher to act meaningfully he needs, in addition, a sense of his role and a confidence in the power of his intellectual imagery. This confidence comes both from the felt power in the ability to evaluate theoretical positions and to match these with evaluations of practical settings; and it comes from the increased skill at deliberation and resulting shared imagery that emerges. Our transcripts document these points.

From the point of view of the teacher the outcome of this process is an habitual use of the capacity to act deliberatively in curriculum planning. This capacity consists of comparing and contrasting theoretical positions, of matching these to preferred positions, of analyzing and diagnosing and evaluating practical situations, and of matching these with theoretical preferences. It further consists of treating the starting points for curriculum planning as tentative, and of modifying those starting points both during planning and in post-instructional evaluation.

DELIBERATIVE STAGES IN OUR STUDY

The various notions described so far have been used to construct five stages for our case study. In the following paragraphs I shall briefly describe these stages and shall indicate some of the research questions asked of the deliberations at each stage. It should be noted that in the asking of questions I have been influenced by Thomas' "A Model for Making and Testing Value Judgments."[10]

For the first three stages and, perhaps, for the latter two, short booklets will be prepared to aid teacher discussion. Booklets for stages 1 and 2 emphasize an auto-instruction guide to selected original materials. These stages are organized along a continuum of the teachers' personal involvement with the choices. Thus, in "Analytic Deliberation," teachers are primarily involved in theoretical comparison and contrast while in "Curriculum Planning--Pre-Instruction" teachers make choices upon which they will have to act.

The five stages are:

1. *The Teacher in Curriculum Development*: The teacher is oriented to a conception of his role in development and is given a feeling for deliberation. Booklets 1 and 2, "A Practitioner's Perspective of Curriculum Development" and "The Feel of Curricular Deliberation," are already available in experimental form.

Questions asked are:

How effective are the materials in stimulating discussion on teacher role?

What problems and issues emerge as teachers consider their role in development?

To what extent is there a shared understanding of their role and, conversely, to what extent do teachers visualize their role differently following stage one?

To what extent does a concern for their role persist through later stages?

To what extent does a concern for and a shared understanding of their role contribute to positive feelings toward deliberation and to giving a sense of significance to the work on deliberation?

2. *Analytic Deliberation*: The teacher is oriented to a range of choice points and to several curriculum-significant alternatives for each. Teachers will be educated in the eclectic habits of mind necessary for deliberating from the theoretical aspect of choice. Booklets 3 through 8 currently are in various stages of preparation and have the general title "Theoretical Considerations: . . . Choice Point" for booklets 3 through 6, and "Practical Considerations: . . . "for booklets 7 and 8.

Questions are:

How readable are the materials and what modifications are suggested in their use for school committees?

How provocative are the materials in contributing to discussion?

What group processes contribute to the ability to recover meaning from the various positions?

What group processes contribute to the ability to compare assumptions and arguments in alternative positions?

What interventions are needed by a group leader or, perhaps, by printed direction in the text, to encourage recovery of meaning?

To what extent does it seem feasible for deliberating teachers to recover meaning; what aspects are most difficult and which most easily done?

What sorts of hypothetical situations aid the examination of educational possibilities found in positions?

To what extent can teachers divorce themselves from their own value preferences in the examination of positions?

What processes in deliberation contribute to the making of theoretically preferred choices in some manner other than mere prejudice?

What reasons do teachers offer for their theoretically preferred choices?

3. *Retrospective Deliberation*: The teacher becomes oriented to the practical aspects of deliberation and he begins to translate his theoretically preferred choices into choices with which he must live. Case studies, existing curricula, proposals for change, and provocative films and other materials will be used and teachers will be asked to take a stand on their desirability. In this way, the teacher is asked to make a value commitment on something over which he has no control and, perhaps more important, for which he does not have to suffer the consequences.

Questions are:

How effective is this stage in providing a transition from a relatively dispassionate commitment to theoretical positions, to a more or less passionate commitment to values governing practice?

Can theoretically preferred choices be shown to contribute to deliberations yielding evaluation and judgment of curriculum materials, programs and the like?

What reasons do teachers offer for their judgements?

4. *Curriculum Planning--Pre-Instruction*: Teachers deal directly with the practical aspects of deliberation in the context of the theoretical aspect. They make choices and act upon them. For this phase we believe that Dewey's notion of a problematic situation is more useful in thinking through the teacher's role than is Schwab's notion of the eclectic. Both treat a theory-practice mix but the eclectic starts in theory while the problematic starts in practice.

Questions asked are:

What kinds of interventions appear to yield telling examinations of actual situations?

What are the similarities and differences in the kinds of interests and contingent facts that different teachers perceive in the diagnosis of their situation?

What techniques are effective in helping teachers identify their practically preferred choices?

What kinds of values and beliefs can be identified and be assumed to exist in common among the group; and to what extent do differences exist?

Are there differences in theory or in practice which, at this stage of commitment, prevent the continuation of group deliberation for some teachers?

Do the processes of deliberation thus far yield an hypothetical mode of operation as teachers plan for instruction?

What interventions contribute to the hypothetical mode?

What reasons do teachers offer for their plans?; for modification of their plans; for modification of practically preferred choices?

5. *Curriculum Planning--During Instruction*: Teachers enter a reflexive phase of deliberation in which their choices and actions are evaluated and modified in the light of classroom interaction and student outcomes. The correspondence between thinking and doing on the part of the teachers will be determined and will be used to modify the recommendations on deliberation practices.

Questions are:

What sorts of records, protocols or recording devices are needed by a teacher to effectively evaluate his instruction?

Is there a demonstrable connection between the deliberations at this stage and with those through stages 1 to 4, in particular to the teacher's view of himself as developer and to his practically preferred choices?

To what extent can group deliberative processes be maintained at this stage?

What reasons do teachers offer for their judgements in instruction?

At the time of writing we are nearing completion of stage 2. We are currently undertaking an analysis of our data and are presenting this in a workshop format in a paper titled "A Case Study of Teacher Choice and Deliberation: Analysis of Deliberative Sessions."

Collected Footnotes

1. Paper delivered at American Educational Research Association (AERA), annual meeting, New Orleans, February 27, 1973.

2. F. Michael Connelly, "The Functions of Curriculum Development", Interchange, Special Issue on School Innovation, Vol. 3, Nos. 2-3 (1972), pp.161-175.

3. Gordon N. Mackenzie, "Why a Strategy for Planned Curricular Innovation?", Strategies for Planned Curricular Innovation, Marcella R. Lawler (ed.), (New York: Teachers College Press, 1970).

4. Joseph J. Schwab, "The Practical: A Language For Curriculum", School Review, 78 (1969), pp.1-24.

5. See Ian Westbury, "The Character of a Curriculum for a 'Practical' Curriculum"; Warner Wick, "Knowledge and Action: The Theory and Practice of 'The Practical'"; and, Seymour Fox, "A Practical Image of 'The Practical'". Curriculum Theory Network, 10 (Fall, 1972), pp.25-57.

6. Joseph J. Schwab, "The Practical: Arts of Electic", School Review, 79 (1971), pp.493-542.

7. Ian Westbury and Jon H. Abrahamson, "Theory and Phenomena in Curriculum Research: The Classroom as a Test Case", paper presented at the annual AERA meeting, Chicago, April, 1972.

8. John Dewey, Logic: The Theory of Inquiry, (Chicago: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1938).

9. Ian Westbury, "The Aristotelian 'Art' of Rhetoric and the 'Art' of Curriculum", paper presented at the American Philosophical Society meeting in 1972.

10. Morris G. Thomas, "A Model for Making and Testing Value Judgments", Philosophical Redirection of Educational Research, National Society for the Study of Education, Seventy-First Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, (Chicago: Chicago Press, 1972) pp.239-257.

11. Barbara Dienes and F. Michael Connelly, "A Case Study of Teacher Choice and Deliberation: Analysis of Deliberative Sessions", paper presented at the annual AERA meetings, New Orleans, February 27, 1973.